Final Report, Regional Campus Concerns Subcommittee, 1/10/2020

Our subcommittee included representatives from each of the other GE subcommittees as well as other faculty and staff from the regional campuses (including ATI). Our main charge was to discuss how regional campuses might be affected by the GE, to take ideas and solutions back to each subcommittee, and to keep the faculty and staff of each regional campus updated on GE implementation progress.

We would first like to **thank the Chairs, members, and Support Team of the main GE Implementation Committee as well as the smaller Subcommittees**. This body was supportive and inclusive of the regional campuses. The faculty, staff, and students on the regional campuses face some unique challenges in the GE-conversion process, and despite being a smaller proportion of The Ohio State University, our ideas and concerns were given the same weight as any other unit on these committees. We were happy to tell our story and build relationships with our Columbus colleagues.

Below we list action items that address concerns that are likely exclusive to regional campuses:

1) We support the recommendation of the Policies and Procedures Subcommittee that **the default under the new GE be that courses approved for Foundations or Themes be automatically approved for <u>all</u> campuses, regardless of mode of delivery** (hybrid, online, in person). Because regional campuses can restrict their online courses to only their students, online and hybrid instruction does not present a competitive financial threat to Departments or Colleges.

2) We are pleased that the Open Themes Subcommittee will give more weight to proposals that demonstrate that a new Theme can be delivered on the regional campuses. The original GE proposal already indicated that each regional campus could choose whether they offered all or some of the Themes. However, we understand this new addition to be about ensuring that **no new Themes will be added if the expertise to teach them does not exist on the regional campuses**.

3) We urge the committee that will ultimately review new Theme proposals to **add only one (and no more than two) Themes at the onset**. Some of the regional campuses want to be able to offer a few classes in all Themes because they are concerned that otherwise students will see their options as restricted and will therefore not enroll or will not stay a second year at the regionals. This loss of enrollment would devastate our budgets and could be detrimental to student success for those students well suited to the small size and personalized attention given at a regional campus. Additionally, we think all students, regardless of campus, will be overwhelmed if given more than 4-5 choices for Themes.

4) Even with only five or six Themes, some regional campuses might still struggle to cover additional courses given heavy teaching workloads (especially on campuses that also teach upper level courses to support up to twelve majors). This will be especially true during the transition period because we may still need to offer as many Foundation-like courses as before in order to cover students who entered under the old GE. Thus, we submitted a proposal to OAA requesting **transitional help with instructional budgets on some campuses**.

5) To assist regionals in covering Themes, we urge the Support Team to add language to the final proposal that indicates that **qualified associated faculty/lecturers can teach Theme courses**.

6) As another way to assist regionals in covering Theme courses, we urge Departments and Colleges to **seek input from their regional campus colleagues about what 3 cr courses they already teach that, with some tweaking, could be considered for inclusion in the new Themes**. Additionally, students indicate they would prefer taking one 4 cr "integrative Theme course" (aka

"high impact practice"/HIP including co-taught interdisciplinary, study away, community-based/service learning, and research courses) than the two x 3 cr option. Thus, to ensure no negative impact on enrollment, some of us believe we need to offer at least one 4 cr course/Theme on regional campuses. Based on the HIP Subcommittee's proposed requirements, most of the 4 cr courses will need to be created outright. We urge Departments to include regional campus faculty in discussions about creation of such courses. **Particularly in the case of the co-taught, interdisciplinary options, regional campus faculty are in excellent creative positions because they interact more frequently with colleagues from a wider range of fields.** However, we have reports that some Departments are not taking these suggestions into consideration because the same match-up between faculty in different disciplines either do not exist or no relationship has yet been established in Columbus. **Thus, in addition to urging Departments to take regional campus faculty ideas seriously, we also urge our regional campus colleagues to help uncover similar connections between faculty in different disciplines in Columbus when making their proposals.**

7) OAA has said there would be money to support faculty who are creating new courses but that this money would only go directly to TIUs and not to regional campuses. Tenure-track regional campus faculty <u>are</u> members of their TIUs; we therefore request that OAA give Departments and Colleges the ability to **distribute some of the course creation money to their regional campus faculty colleague**s. Similarly, the HIP Subcommittee asserted that "integrative course pedagogies require substantially more planning and logistics and therefore warrant some form of added incentive or compensation;" we urge OAA to **include regional faculty in such support**.

8) We appreciate the HIP Subcommittee's call for University support to lower the barriers of access to integrative courses for students with economic challenges (e.g., study away is expensive and community-engaged/service learning requires transportation). The proportion of students who are Pell eligible is higher on the regionals relative to Columbus, so we urge the University to **include regional students in these efforts**.

9) We were pleased to see that the Bookends Subcommittee allowed regional campuses to alter how much of Bookends seminars will be online and that they advocated that, "All faculty on all campuses will be eligible to offer Threads." However, we would like to see **more explicit language** that asserts that students from all campuses can access all Threads through distance delivery and that the technological and logistic needs of such delivery will be covered centrally for all campuses. Additionally, there is language about support and training of faculty involved in Bookends or in GE courses (that require tagging of artefacts), but we hope that the final document makes it clear that this central coverage of training and support includes faculty on all campuses. Although the language reads that OAA will administer the Bookends and that faculty or GTAs will cover grading and delivery of online content, no explicit mention of coverage for grading etc on the regionals is given. We have been reassured that this is the case by administrators and members of the Technology and Bookends Subcommittees, but having it clearly stated in the document ensures continuity if there is any administrator turnover in upcoming years. Also, even if this is added, we know that students will need in-person assistance (particularly about what and how to load materials for the Reflection seminar). This will occur centrally in Columbus and we submitted a proposal to OAA **requesting funding for similar coverage on the regional campuses**.

10) Although covered centrally in Columbus, regional campus advising will be stretched thin during the transition period (when there will be overlap between students under old and new GE systems). Thus, **we requested OAA support for transitional advising**. OAA generously

provided regionals with such support during semester conversion and has indicated similar plans for the GE conversion, which we believe will have more extensive advising needs.

11) We urge the Support Team to continue working toward **changes to Associate of Arts (AA) degree requirements in light of the new reduced Foundation course requirements** (which will be the most similar to current GE courses). For example, AA degrees currently require 6-9 science credits, whereas the Foundations of the new GE require only 3-5. Similarly, the current AA requires 6-9 credit hours in each of Humanities and SBS, whereas the new Foundations only require three each (although the 3 cr required in the new Race, Ethnic, and Gender Diversity category may be applicable to one of these deficient categories). AA degrees are an important milestone toward a 4-year degree that helps with retention efforts on regionals. Additionally, completion of AA degrees augments regional budgets (due to impact on state subsidy equation).

Regional Campus Concerns Subcommittee Membership

Co-Chairs:

Eric Bielefeld: Associate Professor of Speech and Hearing Science, Ohio State Columbus (bielefeld.6@osu.edu); *also Support Team and Policies & Procedures Subcommittee member*

Dawn Kitchen: Professor of Anthropology and Associate Dean, Ohio State Mansfield (kitchen.79@osu.edu); *also HIPs Subcommittee & ad hoc Technology subcommittee member*

Members:

Lyndsey Anderson: Academic Advisor, Ohio State Mansfield; *also Advising Subcommittee member*

Sean Boley: Manager, Academic Advising, Ohio State Lima;

Rachel Bowen: Associate Professor of Political Science, Ohio State Mansfield;
also Bookends Subcommittee member

Stephanie Brown: Associate Professor of English and Associate Dean, Ohio State Newark;
also Open Themes Subcommittee member

Jose Cabral: Associate Professor of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Ohio State Newark;

Nathan Crook: Associate Professor of English and Rural Sociology, Ohio State ATI;

Penny L. Eyster: Academic Advisor, Engineering Program, Ohio State Marion;

Carri Gerber: Associate Professor in CFAES and Assistant Director of Academic Affairs, Wooster/ATI;

Susan Gershman: Associate Professor of Evolution, Ecology & Organismal Biology, Ohio State Marion;
also Policies & Procedures Subcommittee member

Louis Hominga: Senior Academic Advisor, Ohio State Marion;

Sarah Hughes: Director, Academic Advising, Ohio State Newark;

Jamison Kantor: Assistant Professor of English, Ohio State Mansfield;

Rebecca Kapusta: Senior STEP Program Coordinator, Student Life, Ohio State Columbus;

Fabio P. Leite: Associate Professor of Psychology and Associate Dean, Ohio State Lima;
also Policies & Procedures Subcommittee member

John Low: Associate Professor of Comparative Studies, History, & American Indian Studies, Ohio State Newark; *also Expected Learning Outcomes Subcommittee member*

Bishun Pandey: Professor of Mathematics and Associate Dean, Ohio State Marion;

Shellie Shirk: Assistant Director, Academic Advising, Ohio State Marion;

Binaya Subedi: Associate Professor of Education and Assistant Dean, Ohio State Newark;

Anna Willow: Associate Professor of Anthropology, Ohio State Marion;
also Embedded Components Subcommittee member.